

Able Versus Willing to Manipulate Partners in Romantic Relationships

Tamara Bobera

BA (Hons)

A report submitted in partial requirement for the degree of Master of Psychology
(Clinical) at the University of Tasmania

Statement

I declare that this research report is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain material from published sources without proper acknowledgment, nor does it contain material which has been accepted for the award of any other higher degree or graduate diploma in any university.

.....

Tamara Bobera

October 1, 2015

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Dr Rachel Grieve for her expertise, guidance, encouragement, and humour. This year would have been a disaster with any other supervisor so thank you very much for great conversations, giving me directions and most importantly thank you for believing in me.

I would like to also thank to all those who participated in this study as without you the findings of this research would not be possible.

I would like to express my deepest thanks to my family (Milos, Gorana, Jugoslav and Dusica) for support and all the help to make this year bearable. Special thanks to my uncle Milos and auntie Gorana for all the love and care, these two years would not have been possible without you! Also, special thanks to my dearest friends (Neda, Natasa, Annie, Stephanie, Carlyn and Sam) for encouragement, continual support, proof-reading and laughter.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Conceptualising Emotional Manipulation: the “Dark Side” of Emotional Intelligence.....	2
Predicting Emotional Manipulation.....	4
Aversive Personalities.....	4
Romantic relationships and Emotional Manipulation.....	8
The present study.....	9
Method.....	12
Participants.....	12
Design and A-priori Power Analysis.....	12
Materials.....	13
Procedure.....	16
Results.....	17
Assumption Checks.....	17
Preliminary Data Analyses.....	19
Descriptive Statistics.....	20
Hypotheses Testing.....	25
Discussion.....	35
Overview of Findings.....	35
Emotional Manipulation Ability.....	36
Emotional Manipulation Willingness.....	37
Ability Versus Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate.....	41
Unpacking Gender Differences.....	41

Limitations and Directions for Future Research.....	44
Implications.....	47
Conclusions.....	48
References.....	50
Appendices.....	65

List of Tables

Table 1.....	22
<i>Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's Alpha for Male and Female Samples</i>	
Table 2.....	23
<i>Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Female Sample</i>	
Table 3.....	24
<i>Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Female Sample</i>	
Table 4.....	27
<i>Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability for Males and Females</i>	
Table 5.....	32
<i>Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness for Males and Females</i>	

Able Versus Willing to Manipulate Partners in Romantic Relationships

Tamara Bobera

Word Count: 9955 words

Abstract

This study extended investigation of the nature of emotional manipulation by examining for the first time the predictors of ability to emotionally manipulate and predictors of willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. Participants ($N = 324$; 200 females, 124 males) completed an online survey assessing emotional manipulation ability and willingness; Dark Triad traits; Machiavellianism, primary and secondary psychopathy, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism; sadism; and relationship satisfaction. Hypotheses received partial support. For females, higher levels of only grandiose narcissism significantly predicted self-reported emotional manipulation ability, while higher levels of primary psychopathy, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, and lower relationship satisfaction significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partner. For males, higher levels of only grandiose narcissism significantly predicted emotional manipulation ability, while higher levels of primary and secondary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, and sadism positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partner. These findings confirm the distinction between ability to emotionally manipulate and willingness to emotionally manipulate, and inform understanding of the malicious and manipulative use of emotional manipulation within intimate relationships. Future research could utilise behavioural rather than self-report measure of emotional manipulation frequency and different types of romantic relationships (e.g., married) to further clarify the nature of emotional manipulation. It is hoped that findings from this study may help to inform practice in couples therapy.

Literature on emotional intelligence - the ability to appraise and express, regulate and utilise emotions in self and others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) has depicted this construct mainly in a positive light (Austin & O'Donnell, 2013). Nevertheless, this positive view has been broadened by Austin, Farrelly, Black, and Moore (2007) who claimed that emotional intelligence can be utilised negatively and selfishly (i.e., to induce negative feelings and behaviours in others in order to obtain gains). Austin et al. termed this negative notion of emotional intelligence as 'emotional manipulation'.

Emotional manipulation research is in its infancy (Kilduff, Chiaburu, & Menges, 2010), with existing studies predominantly linking it with a number of conceptually similar constructs (e.g., aversive personality traits) (see Grieve & Mahar, 2010). Much remains to be uncovered about the dark side of emotion, and more research is needed to further shed the light on the nature of emotional manipulation (De Raad, 2005; Kilduff et al., 2010) including the distinction between self-reported emotional manipulation ability and willingness to engage in emotional manipulation (e.g., Hyde & Grieve, 2014). Moreover, research on emotional manipulation is yet to consider the specific settings within which emotional manipulation may occur. One potentially good candidate is the context of romantic relationships, which can be characterised by strong emotions, conflicts, as well as various manipulation tactics (Buss, 1992; Schroder-Abe & Schutz, 2011) representing a fruitful ground for emotional manipulation to occur (Dussault, Hojjat, & Boone, 2013).

Importantly, emotional manipulation within romantic relationships can have devastating effects, including violence towards romantic partners (e.g., Shackelford,

Goetz, Buss, Euler, & Hoier, 2005). As such, further understanding ability and willingness to emotionally manipulate partners may be useful in couples therapy, where the target of treatment may involve recognition of various personal characteristics that contribute to engaging in emotional manipulation. Further, a person who is manipulated in the relationship may be helped in understanding why their partner is engaging in emotional manipulation. Also, such knowledge might be used preventatively to assist those who may be continually choosing controlling and manipulative partners in making better relationship choices. It was therefore the purpose of the current study to examine for the first time the distinction between a person's ability and willingness to manipulate his or her romantic partner, and the characteristics that might predict this emotional manipulation.

Conceptualising Emotional Manipulation: the “Dark Side” of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is broadly conceptualised as the capacity to recognise and regulate emotions in self and others (Kemp et al., 2005; Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010). Initial scientific enquiry into emotional intelligence warned that a person may use their emotional intelligence skills in a destructive way for self-serving purposes, for example, to induce unpleasant feelings in someone (Epstein, 1998; Mayer, 2001; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). However, since that time, emotional intelligence research has focused on the prosocial aspects of the construct (e.g., Palmer, Donaldson, & Stough, 2002), neglecting earlier cautions about the potential ‘dark side’ of emotional intelligence.

More recently, Austin et al. (2007) explicitly addressed these early cautions around the negative side of emotional intelligence by operationalising it as emotional manipulation - the ability to manipulate emotions of another person in order to obtain

goals or to benefit oneself. Austin et al. developed an emotional manipulation scale that assessed three factors: general emotional manipulation tendency, perceived poor emotional skills, and emotional concealment. Results indicated that there were individual differences in the self-reported levels of emotional manipulation.

However, Austin et al.'s (2007) conceptualisation of emotional manipulation refers to a person's self-reported belief that they have an ability to emotionally manipulate others; it does not reveal whether a person with this self-reported belief will actually engage in such acts (Hyde & Grieve, 2014). This differentiation between ability and willingness shows some parallels with trait vs. ability distinctions of emotional intelligence (Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). Trait approaches regard emotional intelligence as a trait or collection of emotionally related 'typical' consistencies in behaviours where individuals self-assess their emotional skills using self-report measures (Ermer, Kahn, Salovey, & Kiehl, 2012; Petrides & Furnham, 2000). In contrast, ability approaches equate emotional intelligence with cognitive intelligence, assessing it by measuring a person's maximal performance on emotional tasks (for example, identifying the emotion in facial expression) (Ermer et al., 2012; Roberts, Zeidner, & Matthews, 2001). Despite differences in conceptualisations and measurements (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008) both approaches are more complementary than opposing (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000). For example, both heightened trait and ability emotional intelligence are associated with prosocial outcomes (such as better mental and physical health) (Martins et al., 2010).

It can therefore be argued that Austin et al.'s (2007) self-report measure of emotional manipulation may assess trait or typical rather than ability or maximal emotional manipulation performance (Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). In line with these suggestions, and because of the malicious nature of emotional manipulation

(for example, one might know how to manipulate others, but chooses not to), Hyde and Grieve (2014) revised Austin et al.'s original measure to capture *willingness* to emotionally manipulate others. Two related ($r = .54$), but distinct factors emerged, termed self-reported emotional manipulation ability, and emotional manipulation willingness.

Hyde and Grieve (2014) called for additional research to further clarify distinctions between these factors, and in particular, the potential utility of examining these factors separately. This more refined approach to the operationalisation of emotional manipulation is particularly important, given that to date (with the exception of Hyde and Grieve's study, which was limited in scope due to its exploratory nature) only the predictors of self-reported emotional manipulation ability have been assessed. A comprehensive investigation of characteristics that might influence both self-reported ability as well as willingness to emotionally manipulate would provide valuable information about the nomological nature of the construct.

Predicting Emotional Manipulation

Aversive personalities. Existing research has focused on linking emotional manipulation with conceptually related constructs, such as elements of the cluster of aversive personalities - the "Dark Triad" (e.g., Grieve & Mahar, 2010). The Dark Triad comprises Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

Machiavellianism describes a person with a cynical worldview, lacking sincerity, and who manipulates others for personal gain (Christie & Geis, 1970). Psychopathy was traditionally treated as a homogenous construct, however later theory and research suggests that psychopathy can be differentiated into primary and

secondary subtypes (e.g., Douglas, Bore, & Munro, 2012; Skeem, Johansson, Andershed, Kerr, & Louden, 2007). Primary psychopathy is characterised by callousness, shallow affect, and lack of remorse, while secondary psychopathy is characterised by antisocial behaviour, impulsivity and aggression (Hodson, Hogg, & MacInnis, 2009).

Similar to psychopathy, there are two facets of narcissism: grandiose and vulnerable (e.g., Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008; Dickinson & Pincus, 2003; Miller et al., 2011). Grandiose narcissism falls under the prototypical view of narcissism - an increased sense of self-worth and entitlement, need for admiration and for power, expressed through self-centred, controlling and exploitative interpersonal styles (Gentile et al., 2013; Pincus et al., 2009; Raskin & Terry, 1988). By contrast, vulnerable narcissism is characterised by fragile grandiosity signified by heightened sensitivity to others' evaluations (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003), low self-esteem (Pincus et al., 2009), social withdrawal (Pincus, Cain, & Wright, in press), and feelings of inadequacy and shame (Kealy & Rasmussen, 2012).

Although related to each other (Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus, 2013), the distinctiveness between the Dark Triad members is evident in their independent contributions in predicting a number of variables. These include psychopathy predicting workplace bullying (Baughman, Dearing, Giammarco, & Vernon, 2012) and Machiavellianism predicting deception (Giammarco, Atkinson, Baughman, Veselka, & Vernon, 2013).

Most of the Dark Triad constructs show positive associations with emotional manipulation ability. For example, Austin et al. (2007) found that Machiavellianism accounted for 16% of the variance in emotional manipulation ability. Primary psychopathy consistently positively and significantly predicted self-reported

emotional manipulation ability (e.g., Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Hyde & Grieve, 2014). Nagler, Reiter, Furtner, and Rauthmann (2014) uncovered the positive and significant link between grandiose narcissism and emotional manipulation ability. In contrast, the relationship between secondary psychopathy and emotional manipulation ability is less clear. For example, Grieve and Mahar (2010) found that higher levels of secondary psychopathy significantly predicted emotional manipulation ability among females, while this effect was not observed among males. Grieve and Panebianco (2013) reported similar results. Yet Hyde and Grieve (2014) found no associations between emotional manipulation ability and secondary psychopathy when gender was controlled for. These mixed findings could be explained by the non-inclusion of other Dark Triad members in these studies. Specifically, when all of the Dark Triad members are considered and their shared variance is accounted for, the predictions of each Dark Triad member become more distinct (Furnham et al., 2013).

Vulnerable narcissism is characterised by interpersonal manipulation (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001) and the utility of vulnerable narcissism in emotional manipulation was flagged by Austin, Saklofske, Smith, and Tohver (2014) who examined the link between the Dark Triad and non-prosocial aspects of emotional intelligence. These aspects of emotional intelligence include manipulation tactics such as worsening others' moods (for example, by undermining them) and insincere self-serving displays (such as acting nice). Conceptually, these tactics are similar to emotional manipulation willingness, as a person needs to not only know how to do them, but also to *engage* in such behaviours to achieve gains. Results indicated that both mood-worsening and inauthenticity had significant and positive links with vulnerable narcissism.

In addition, recent suggestions are that sadism - the tendency to humiliate and be cruel for personal pleasure and dominance over others (O'Meara, Davies, & Hammond, 2011) should be considered in within the Dark Triad taxonomy, creating a Dark Tetrad (e.g., Buckels, Jones, & Paulhus, 2013; Chabrol, Leeuwen, Rodgers, & Sejourne, 2009). The call for the inclusion of sadism is based on findings which indicate low to moderate correlations between the Dark Triad and sadism traits, as well their distinct predictive utility for behaviours such as delinquency (Chabrol et al., 2009), preference to kill insects, and to hurt innocent victims (Buckels et al., 2013). This aligns with Furnham et al.'s (2013) review which concluded that dark personalities are bound by shared callousness. Only one study to date examined the links between the Dark Triad and emotional manipulation willingness (e.g., Hyde & Grieve, 2014). Findings indicated that both primary and secondary psychopathy positively and significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate. However, as mentioned, this study is limited due to its exploratory nature.

Interim summary. In summary, positive associations between Machiavellianism, primary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, and emotional manipulation ability are consistent (e.g., Austin et al., 2014), with some differences as a function of gender evident (e.g., Grieve & Panebianco, 2013). However, links between secondary psychopathy and ability to emotionally manipulate are less clear. Moreover, positive and significant links between primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy and willingness to emotionally manipulate have been suggested (e.g., Hyde & Grieve, 2014), with a possible role of vulnerable narcissism in willingness to emotionally manipulate (e.g., Austin et al., 2014). Further, no study to date has examined the relationship between sadism and emotional manipulation. Examining the comprehensive contribution of all the Dark Triad members and sadism may

provide a richer understanding of emotional manipulation, as the independent contributions of distinctive features of each aversive trait would then become evident (Furnham et al., 2013).

Additionally, while the above studies provide some insight into the nature of emotional manipulation, further research is required to systematically investigate role of the Dark Triad in both emotional manipulation ability and emotional manipulation willingness. Examining both aspects of emotional manipulation may control for their shared variance (Grieve, 2011) and hence provide a better understanding of the construct.

Romantic Relationships and Emotional Manipulation

Previous research has examined emotional manipulation in general, rather than considering that emotional manipulation might be used differently in differing emotionally laden contexts (Kilduff et al., 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013), although recent research suggests that emotional manipulation can influence friendships (Abell, Brewer, Qualter, & Austin, 2016). Romantic relationships are characterised by our deepest and strongest emotions, as well as conflicts (Fitness, 2001) and use of various manipulation tactics within relationships has been noted (e.g., Buss, 1987). As such, while emotional intelligence has traditionally been positively implicated in romantic relationships (Malouff, Schutte, & Thorsteinsson, 2014; Schutte et al., 2001), it follows that romantic relationships are a likely context in which emotional manipulation might occur.

The potential negative use of emotional intelligence in romantic relationships parallels with Austin et al.'s (2007) conceptualisation of emotional manipulation as the 'dark side' of emotional intelligence. In line with this, Fitness (2006) stated that emotional intelligence could be used by individuals in manipulative ways to

recognise their partner's vulnerabilities and insecurities and exploit the same for their own benefit. Fitness and Matthews' (1998) study on marital forgiveness, revealed that one of the female participants with high emotional intelligence reported how she manipulated her former partner into an angry outburst, which she then utilised as an excuse to play the victim in marriage.

Further support for the potential use of emotional manipulation in romantic contexts comes from research indicating that manipulation tactics are utilised in romantic relationships. Three manipulation tactics are more specific to romantic relationships compared to other close relationships (for example friendships) and include: coercion (e.g., "I threaten him with something if he doesn't do it"), regression (e.g., "I pout until he does it"), and responsibility invocation (e.g., "Give her a deadline to do it") (e.g., Buss, 1992; Buss, Gomes, Higgins, & Lauterbach, 1987), as well as mate-retention tactics (e.g., Buss, 1988; Buss & Shackelford, 1997) including using emotion to elicit desired relationship behaviour (Shackelford, Goetz, & Buss, 2005; Shackelford & Buss, 2000).

The Present Study

Given the limitations of existing research in terms of assessment of the predictors of the malicious use of emotion (e.g., Austin et al., 2007; Austin et al., 2014; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013); the difference between self-reported ability and willingness to engage in emotional manipulation (Hyde & Grieve, 2014); and the need to expand understanding of emotional manipulation in specific contexts (e.g., Kildruff et al., 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013); the present study aimed to further investigate the nature of emotional manipulation in three ways. Firstly, by considering the role of the comprehensive Dark Triad and sadism, it was hoped that the predictors of emotional manipulation might be more fully

explored. Secondly, by differentiating self-reported ability from willingness it was anticipated that the role of these predictors would receive a more nuanced consideration. Thirdly, this study used a specific, emotionally-laden context to examine emotional manipulation: romantic relationships.

Finally, within the context of the current study, it is also important to note that manipulation tactics are negatively associated with relationship quality, especially relationship satisfaction. For instance, Shackelford and Buss (2000) uncovered that both males and females whose spouses used emotional manipulation tactics (e.g., “She threatened to harm herself if he ever left”) were less satisfied with their marriage than those whose partners did not engage in such acts. Similarly, women whose partners engaged in sexual coercion manipulation tactics in their romantic relationship (e.g., “My partner withheld benefits that I depend on to get me to have sex with him”) were less satisfied with their relationship compared to those whose partners do not engage in sexual coercion (Shackelford & Goetz, 2004).

These studies suggest that manipulation tactics in relationships are often associated with poor relationship satisfaction. While the direction of this association is unclear, it may be that if individuals are satisfied with their current romantic relationship they may not feel the need to emotionally manipulate their romantic partners. By contrast, those that are dissatisfied with their current romantic relationship may wish to emotionally manipulate their romantic partner and hence decide to engage in such act. Therefore, it is important to assess a person’s level of relationship satisfaction while investigating the emotional manipulation in romantic relationships.

It was hypothesised that the combination of Dark Triad members would predict both ability and willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partner

(Hypothesis 1). Based on existing research (e.g., Austin et al., 2007; Austin et al., 2014; Hyde & Grieve, 2014; Nagler et al., 2014), this hypothesis entailed a number of specific predictions: primary psychopathy would positively predict both emotional manipulation ability and willingness (1a); secondary psychopathy would positively predict emotional manipulation willingness (1b); Machiavellianism would positively predict emotional manipulation ability (1c); grandiose narcissism would positively predict emotional manipulation ability (1d); vulnerable narcissism would positively predict emotional manipulation willingness.

The second hypothesis was that due to its conceptual nature of cruelty and dominance (e.g. O'Meara et al., 2011), sadism would explain additional variance in emotional manipulation ability and willingness, over and above the Dark Triad. Higher levels of sadism were predicted to be associated with greater emotional manipulation.

The third hypothesis was that relationship satisfaction would explain additional variance in emotional manipulation ability and willingness over and above sadism and the Dark Triad. Specifically, in line with Shackelford and Buss (2000), it was hypothesised that relationship satisfaction would negatively predict emotional manipulation ability and emotional manipulation willingness.

Previous research has consistently shown gender differences in emotional manipulation (e.g., Grieve & Mahar, 2010) and Dark Triad traits (e.g. Chabrol et al., 2009). Therefore, in line with Grieve and Panebianco's (2013) recommendation, data were analysed separately for males and females.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 324 participants ($n = 200$ female; $n = 124$ male) aged between 18 and 59 years ($M = 26.95$, $SD = 8.89$). Participants were recruited through social networking websites, message boards, and the research participation program at University of Tasmania. Participants were mostly full-time workers (42.6%) and students (45.4%). The mean romantic relationship length was approximately four years ($M = 52.8$ months, $SD = 71.7$).¹ The majority of the participants were from an English speaking background, with 86.1% indicating English as their first language. Most of the sample identified themselves as being Australian (80.2%). The sample was well educated with 15.1% having completed undergraduate degree and 32.7% currently undertaking undergraduate degree. For participation in the current study, students from the University of Tasmania were compensated by receiving course credit, while the general public had a chance to enter a draw to win a gift voucher.

Selection criteria. Participants were required to be over the age 18 and currently in a romantic relationship. Since studies use numerous ways to define relationships and there are no established guidelines on what constitutes a romantic relationship, the present study followed the protocol by Schroder-Abe and Schutz (2011) where the mean relationship length was used instead of a specified relationship length (i.e., 3 months, 6 months).

Design and A-priori Power Analysis

A cross-sectional, correlational design was used. The outcome variables were partner emotional manipulation ability and willingness. Predictor variables were Machiavellianism, primary and secondary psychopathy, grandiose and vulnerable

¹ Since responses on the relationship length variable were open (i.e., free text), several values were excluded due to lack of interpretability (e.g., “married”).

narcissism, sadism, and relationship satisfaction. A minimum sample size of 111 females and 111 males was required for hierarchical multiple regression to allow sufficient power according to formula $N = 104 + k$, where k is the number of predictors (in this case, 7) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2002). Hence, with the sample size of 200 females and 124 males, power was sufficient.

Control variables. Two versions of the survey were made available to participants, to minimise order effects.

Materials

In addition to demographic information, data were collected for the following variables. See Appendix A for a complete copy of the questionnaire.

Partner emotional manipulation ability. Austin et al.'s (2007) 10-item scale was adapted to capture self-reported ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. For example, the original item 'I know how to make another person feel uneasy' became 'I know how to make my partner feel uneasy'. Responses to items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Thus high scores indicated high levels of ability to emotionally manipulate ones partner. Reliability for the original emotional manipulation ability scale is excellent (Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013).

Partner emotional manipulation willingness. The 10-item emotional manipulation willingness scale (Hyde & Grieve, 2014) was reframed to assess willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. For example, the original item 'How often do you play two people off against each other?' became 'How often do you play your partner off against another person?'. Responses to items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*daily*). High scores indicated

greater willingness. The original scale has good internal reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$) (Hyde & Grieve, 2014).

Machiavellianism. The Mach-IV Scale (Christie & Geis, 1970) was used to assess Machiavellianism. The Mach-IV comprises 20 items (e.g., 'The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear') assessing the use of deceit in interpersonal relationships, a cynical attitude to human nature and a lack of morality. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), with high scores indicating high levels of Machiavellianism. The Mach-IV has demonstrated robust internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$; Rauthmann, 2013).

Psychopathy. The Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP) (Levenson, Kiehl, & Fitzpatrick, 1995) was used. The LSRP is a 26-item questionnaire that measures primary and secondary psychopathy on a 4-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 4 (*agree strongly*). Sixteen items measure primary psychopathy (e.g., 'In today's world, I feel justified in doing anything I can get away with to succeed') and 10 items measure secondary psychopathy ('I find myself in the same kinds of trouble, time after time'). High scores indicated greater psychopathy. Internal consistency is robust and acceptable, for primary and secondary psychopathy, respectively (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.88$ and $.74$), (Ali & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2010).

Grandiose narcissism. Grandiose Narcissism was assessed with the Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16) (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006), which is an abbreviated version of Raskin and Hall's (1981) 40-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory. The NPI-16 uses a forced choice response format. One of the responses is coded as narcissistic (e.g., 'I like to be the centre of attention') and one

is coded as non-narcissistic (e.g., 'I prefer to blend in with the crowd'). Although the forced choice format in NPI reduces the effects of social desirability, Likert scales are more appropriate for correlation-type designs (Kubarych, Deary, & Austin, 2004). Hence, the present study used 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The NPI-16 has demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$; Gentile et al., 2013) and validity (Ames et al., 2006; Gentile et al., 2013).

Vulnerable narcissism. The Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI) (Pincus et al., 2009) was used to assess vulnerable narcissism. The PNI is a 52-item questionnaire assessing both vulnerable and grandiose narcissism on a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from 0 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*). Vulnerable narcissism is measured using four subscales: 12-item Contingent Self-Esteem subscale (e.g., 'I am disappointed when people don't notice me'), 7-item Hiding the Self subscale (e.g., 'It's hard to show others the weaknesses I feel inside'), 7-item Devaluing and Entitlement Rage subscale (e.g., 'When others disappoint me, I often get angry at myself'), and 8-items Entitlement Rage subscale (e.g., 'I get angry when criticised'). Given that the grandiose narcissism subscales in PNI do not show adequate factor loadings (see Miller et al., 2011), the present study utilised only Vulnerable Narcissism subscales from PNI. Higher scores indicate higher levels of vulnerable narcissism. The PNI vulnerable narcissism subscales have adequate internal consistency (Cronbach's α range from .78 to .93) and have good validity (Pincus et al., 2009).

Sadism. The Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS) (O'Meara et al., 2011) was used to assess sadism. The SSIS Scale contains 10-items (e.g., 'I enjoy seeing people hurt') that are recorded in dichotomous form (*like me* and *unlike me*). To allow for

extra variance for regression analysis and given that the correlation coefficient for dichotomous items underestimates the degree of correlation (Carroll, 1961), a Likert scale format was used. The responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (*very unlike me*) to 6 (*very like me*). The SSIS has very good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$; O'Meara et al., 2011) and has demonstrated concurrent validity with empathy, interpersonal relating, and parental bonding measures (Buckels et al., 2013).

Relationship satisfaction. Perceived Relationship Quality Components

Inventory (PRQC; Fletcher, Simpson, & Thomas, 2000) was used to assess relationship satisfaction. The PRQC contains 18 items assessing six intercorrelated domains of relationship quality: satisfaction (e.g., 'How satisfied are you with your relationship?'), commitment (e.g., 'How dedicated are you to your relationship?'), intimacy (e.g., 'How connected are you to your partner?'), trust (e.g., 'How much do you trust your partner?'), passion (e.g., 'How lustful is your relationship?'), and love (e.g., 'How much do you adore your partner?'). The responses are recorded on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*). A total score is computed by averaging scores for the 18 items. The PRQC has been shown to have excellent internal reliability for all of the subscales (Cronbach's $\alpha > .90$) and validity (e.g., Fletcher et al., 2000; Kachadourian, Fincham, & Davila, 2004).

Procedure

The study was approved by Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC Reference Number: H0014339) (see Appendix B). Interested individuals were invited to participate in an anonymous online survey investigating "Emotion in Romantic Relationships". The information letter and the informed consent were presented prior to the survey questions (see Appendix B). The

last page of the survey contained a debriefing statement (see Appendix B), and a separate link was provided for participants to give their contact details to receive their course credit (first year psychology students) or to go into the draw to win a gift voucher (community members).

Results

Assumption Checks

Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 21. None of the variables had missing values as the respondents were required to complete each question to advance in the online questionnaire.

Assumption checks were conducted separately for males and females.

Data assumption checks for females. The data were examined for deviations from normality at the univariate level and univariate outliers. Scores on the Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, primary and secondary psychopathy, sadism, and partner emotional manipulation willingness were significantly and positively skewed, as evident through histograms and Z scores of skewness statistics ($Z > 1.96$). Given the anti-social nature of these traits, this may have reflected the floor effects. Scores on relationship satisfaction were significantly and negatively skewed.

The data were then screened for univariate outliers to examine if these were influencing skewness statistics. Examination of boxplots detected five extreme ($3 \times IQR$) and 23 mild ($1.5 - 3 \times IQR$) univariate outliers. To reduce their potential impact, scores for these outlying cases were recoded into three standard deviations from the mean (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). However, recoding did not improve the distributions of the variables.

Consequently, appropriate transformations were applied to reduce skewness. However, analyses based on transformed data did not differ from the analysis with the raw data at either variable or regression analysis level. Because of this, and since analyses based on the F distribution are robust to breaches of normality (Keppel & Wickens, 2004), the decision to use non-transformed data was made.

Assumptions of multicollinearity and singularity were met. The Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) were well below 10 (highest VIF = 1.17), Tolerance statistics were all greater than .2 (lowest Tolerance = .53), and no multicollinearity was present in accordance with suggested guidelines (O'Brien, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Durbin-Watson statistic indicated independence of errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) for partner emotional manipulation ability and emotional manipulation willingness in this sample with $d = 2.11$ and 2.01 , respectively.

On initial regression analysis, casewise diagnostics identified one outlier (standard residuals > 3 , Cook's $d = .08$). Regression analyses were run with and without this case, however the case was not influential, thus was retained for the analyses. Examination of residual scatterplots indicated different spread over range of residuals and evenly distributed residuals suggesting that assumptions of homoscedasticity and linearity were met. Normal probability plots and histogram of standardised residuals suggested normal distribution meeting the assumption of multivariate normality.

Data assumption checks for males. The assumption checks described above were also conducted on the male data. Scores on the primary psychopathy, sadism, and partner emotional willingness were significantly and positively skewed, again possibly reflecting floor effects. Scores on relationship satisfaction were significantly

and negatively skewed. Fifteen mild univariate outliers ($1.5-3 \times IQR$) were detected using boxplots. Recording of scores for these cases into three standard deviations from the mean (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) did not improve normality.

Transformations were then applied to reduce the skewness, but there was no difference between analyses based on transformed scale scores and analysis with the untransformed data at both variable and regression analysis level. Hence, analysis of the untransformed data is reported.

The assumptions of multicollinearity and singularity were met as the Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) were well below 10 (highest VIF = 2.74), Tolerance statistics were all greater than .2 (lowest Tolerance = .37), and the bivariate correlations were not problematic (O'Brien, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Durbin-Watson statistic showed independence of errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) for partner emotional manipulation ability and emotional manipulation willingness in male sample ($d = 2.00$; $d = 1.88$). Further evaluation of assumptions indicated no multivariate outliers, and no significant violations of normality, linearity or homoscedasticity of residuals.

Preliminary Data Analyses

Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to identify any systematic differences in the sample as a function of gender, survey order and student status. The proportion of students in the sample did not differ by gender, $\chi^2(1, N = 324) = 0.08, p = .772$. The proportion of participants completing the first survey version did not differ by gender or student status, $\chi^2(1, N = 324) = 2.23, p = .135$, and $\chi^2(1, N = 324) = 0.92, p = .335$, respectively.

Independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to investigate whether significant differences in the variables could be observed as a product of gender, student versus

non-student status, or the different survey orders. Correlations were used to examine potential effects of relationship length (full details of the comparisons are presented Appendix C). Using Bonferroni adjusted alpha level ($\alpha = .05/9 = 0.005$) significant findings were observed as a product of gender. Males reported more Machiavellianism, grandiose narcissism, sadism, primary and secondary psychopathy than females. The effects were moderate for Machiavellianism (Cohen's $d = 0.52$) and primary psychopathy (Cohen's $d = 0.63$) and sadism (Cohen's $d = 0.69$), while the effects were small for grandiose narcissism (Cohen's $d = 0.38$) and secondary psychopathy (Cohen's $d = 0.37$). These effects were consistent with previous literature (Chabrol et al., 2009; O'Meara et al., 2011; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). No systematic differences were evident as a function of student versus non-student status or the different survey orders, and all effect sizes were small. Relationship length was not significantly associated with scores on any of the predictor or outcome variables, with the maximum amount of variance explained by relationship length only 1.21%.

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations and internal reliability coefficients for each variable in male and female samples are summarised in Table 1. Descriptive statistics were similar to those seen in previous research (Ali, Amorim, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2009; Ames et al., 2006; Grieve & Mahar, 2010; Grieve & Panebianco, 2012; Hyde & Grieve, 2014; Kachadourian et al., 2004; Pincus et al., 2009). As the present study used a Likert format for the sadism measure, interpretation of means and standard deviations against the previous research is limited. However, the majority of participants scored at the lower end of the sadism (i.e., less sadism), which is in accordance with previous studies (O'Meara et al., 2001). Internal

reliability ranged from good to excellent, except for secondary psychopathy among females which were acceptable. Nevertheless, internal reliability of secondary psychopathy was consistent with previous research (e.g., Levenson et al., 1995).

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's Alpha for Male and Female Samples

Scale	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		Cronbach's Alpha	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
M	57.54 (9.46)	52.81 (8.55)	.75	.72
PP	30.85 (9.28)	25.78 (6.38)	.90	.81
SP	21.47 (4.73)	19.79 (4.29)	.71	.65
GN	45.31 (11.22)	41.23 (10.07)	.89	.86
VN	1.94 (0.95)	1.86 (0.83)	.95	.94
S	21.12 (10.36)	15.29 (5.88)	.90	.80
PEMA	27.81 (11.38)	24.89 (9.92)	.94	.92
PEMW	19.89 (7.24)	18.12 (5.46)	.88	.78
RS	104.99 (15.35)	108.82 (16.14)	.93	.95

Note: *N* = 324; M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction

Pearson's bivariate correlations were calculated and are presented in Table 2 and Table 3. For both genders, partner emotional manipulation ability and partner emotional manipulation willingness had significant positive relationships with the Dark Triad members and sadism. For both genders, there was a significant negative relationship between partner emotion manipulation willingness and relationship satisfaction. However, a significant (negative) association between emotional manipulation ability and relationship satisfaction was only evident in males.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Female Sample

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. M	1.00								
2. PP	.52**	1.00							
3. SP	.39**	.36**	1.00						
4. GN	.07	.37**	.17*	1.00					
5. VN	.34**	.22*	.44*	.16*	1.00				
6. S	.48**	.53**	.46**	.24*	.34**	1.00			
7. PEMA	.20*	.21*	.21*	.38**	.20*	.27**	1.00		
8. PEMW	.21**	.33*	.26**	.27**	.27**	.23*	.59**	1.00	
9. RS	-.26**	-.21*	-.20*	.13*	-.13*	-.21*	-.11	-.27**	1.00

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction

N = 324, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

Table 3

Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Male Sample

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. M	1.00								
2. PP	.61**	1.00							
3. SP	.37**	.48**	1.00						
4. GN	.32**	.59**	.31**	1.00					
5. VN	.40**	.45**	.55**	.42**	1.00				
6. S	.53**	.67**	.46**	.51**	.52**	1.00			
7. PEMA	.42**	.50**	.39**	.51**	.44**	.53**	1.00		
8. PEMW	.35**	.65**	.49**	.58**	.47**	.59**	.70**	1.00	
9. RS	-.25*	-.30*	-.28*	.14	-.15	-.28*	-.24*	-.30*	1.00

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction

N = 324, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

Hypotheses Testing

Hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analyses, separately for males and females. Partner emotional manipulation ability and partner emotional manipulation willingness were entered as outcome variables. Results for partner emotional manipulation ability and partner emotional manipulation willingness are shown in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

Partner emotional manipulation ability for females. In the first step, Machiavellianism, primary and secondary psychopathy, vulnerable and grandiose narcissism accounted for 19.2% of the variance in partner emotional manipulation ability. This was significant, $R = .44$, $F(5, 194) = 9.22$, $p < .001$, with a small effect size ($f^2 = 0.24$) (Cohen, 1992). Grandiose narcissism was a significant positive predictor of partner emotional manipulation ability.

Adding sadism to the model explained virtually no additional variance, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 193) = 2.43$, $p = .121$. Within this model, again, only grandiose narcissism had a significant contribution. The model was significant $R = .45$, $F(6, 193) = 8.14$, $p < .001$, with small effect ($f^2 = 0.25$).

Similarly, adding relationship satisfaction to the model explained almost no additional variance, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 192) = 2.97$, $p = .09$. This was a significant model, $R = .46$, $F(7, 192) = 7.47$, $p < .001$, with small effect ($f^2 = 0.27$). Again, only grandiose narcissism had a significant positive contribution within the model.

Partner emotional manipulation ability for males. A three-step hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. At step 1, Machiavellianism, primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy, vulnerable and grandiose narcissism accounted for 38% of the variance in partner emotional manipulation ability. This

was a significant model $R = .62$, $F(5, 118) = 14.64$, $p < .001$, with a moderate effect size $f^2 = 0.61$. Grandiose narcissism was a significant positive predictor.

Including sadism in the model explained virtually no additional variance, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 117) = 3.77$, $p = .055$. The combined model was significant, $R = .63$, $F(6, 117) = 13.11$, $p < .001$ and represented a moderate effect ($f^2 = 0.67$). Grandiose narcissism remained a significant individual predictor.

Adding relationship satisfaction to the model explained no additional variance, and the model was not significantly improved, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 116) = 0.87$, $p = .352$. The model remained significant, $R = .64$, $F(7, 116) = 11.35$, $p < .001$, with a moderate effect size ($f^2 = 0.69$). Again, grandiose narcissism had a significant contribution within the model.

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability for Males and Females

	Females							Males						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper						Lower	Upper
<u>Step 1</u>														
M	.166	.094	.143	1.752	.081	-.021	.352	.203	.113	.169	1.797	.075	-.021	.426
PP	-.059	.130	-.038	-.454	.650	-.316	.198	.125	.138	.102	.903	.368	-.149	.398
SP	.178	.177	.077	1.003	.317	-.172	.528	.276	.221	.115	1.249	.214	-.161	.713
GN	.361	.070	.366	5.145	.000	.222	.499	.303	.094	.299	3.229	.002	.117	.489
VN	.023	.026	.066	.889	.375	-.028	.075	.049	.033	.138	1.471	.144	-.017	.115
<u>Step 2</u>														
M	.137	.096	.118	1.425	.156	-.053	.326	.163	.113	.136	1.441	.152	-.061	.388
PP	-.123	.136	-.079	-.903	.368	-.391	.146	.034	.144	.028	.234	.815	-.252	.319

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

	Females							Males						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper						Lower	Upper
SP	.111	.182	.048	.608	.544	-.248	.469	.239	.219	.099	1.090	.278	-.195	.672
GN	.353	.070	.359	5.048	.000	.215	.491	.274	.094	.270	2.916	.004	.088	.460
VN	.018	.026	.053	.706	.481	-.033	.070	.035	.034	.099	1.045	.298	-.031	.102
S	.221	.142	.131	1.558	.121	-.059	.500	.224	.115	.204	1.942	.055	-.004	.452
<u>Step 3</u>														
M	.122	.096	.105	1.270	.206	-.067	.311	.157	.114	.131	1.385	.169	-.068	.383
PP	-.154	.137	-.099	-1.129	.260	-.424	.115	.020	.145	.017	.140	.889	-.267	.307

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

	Females							Males						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper						Lower	Upper
SP	.087	.182	.038	.478	.633	-.271	.445	.206	.222	.086	.930	.354	-.233	.646
GN	.383	.072	.389	5.339	.000	.241	.524	.279	.094	.275	2.959	.004	.092	.465
VN	.547	.886	.046	.618	.538	-1.200	2.294	1.273	1.146	.106	1.110	.269	-.998	3.543
S	.206	.141	.122	1.460	.146	-.072	.485	.213	.116	.194	1.834	.069	-.017	.443
RS	-.073	.042	-.119	-1.724	.086	-.157	.011	-.053	.057	-.072	-.934	.352	-.166	.060

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction.

Partner emotional manipulation willingness for females. In the first step, 18% of the variance in partner emotional manipulation willingness was explained by the Dark Triad. This was significant, $R = .42$, $F(5, 194) = 8.47$, $p < .001$, representing a small effect ($f^2 = 0.22$). Primary psychopathy, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were significant positive predictors of partner emotional manipulation willingness.

The addition of sadism to the model explained no additional variance, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $\Delta F(1, 193) = 0.11$, $p = .747$. Within this model, primary psychopathy, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism remained significant positive predictors. The model was significant $R = .42$, $F(6, 193) = 7.05$, $p < .001$ with small effect size ($f^2 = 0.22$).

When relationship satisfaction was added to the model, 23% of variance in partner emotional manipulation willingness was explained, an additional 5% of variance. This was a significant improvement, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F(1, 192) = 12.67$, $p < .001$. The combined model was significant, $R = .48$, $F(7, 192) = 8.21$, $p < .001$ with a small effect ($f^2 = 0.30$). Higher partner emotional manipulation willingness was significantly predicted by greater primary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism and lower scores in relationship satisfaction.

Partner emotional manipulation willingness for males. In the initial step, 54% of the variance in partner emotional manipulation willingness was explained by the Dark Triad. This was a significant model, $R = .73$, $F(5, 118) = 27.22$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size ($f^2 = 1.17$). Primary psychopathy, secondary psychopathy and grandiose narcissism were significant positive predictors.

When sadism was included, 55% of variance was explained, an additional 2% of variance. This was a significant improvement, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 117) = 4.62$, $p = .03$. The model remained significant, $R = .74$, $F(6, 117) = 24.15$, $p < .001$, with a large effect ($f^2 = 1.22$). Higher partner emotional manipulation willingness scores

were significantly predicted by higher scores on primary and secondary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, and sadism.

Adding relationship satisfaction to the model explained almost no additional variance, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 116) = 1.81$, $p = .181$. The model was significant, $R = .75$, $F(7, 116) = 21.11$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size ($f^2 = 1.27$). Again, primary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, and sadism had a significant positive contribution, while secondary psychopathy was no longer a significant predictor in the model.

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness for Males and Females

	Females							Males						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper						Lower	Upper
<u>Step 1</u>														
M	-.001	.052	-.001	-.017	.986	-.104	.102	-.077	.062	-.101	-1.243	.216	-.201	.046
PP	.180	.072	.211	2.493	.013	.038	.323	.333	.076	.427	4.375	.000	.182	.484
SP	.118	.098	.092	1.195	.233	-.076	.312	.275	.122	.180	2.254	.026	.033	.516
GN	.082	.039	.150	2.097	.037	.005	.158	.170	.052	.263	3.273	.001	.067	.272
VN	.031	.014	.160	2.141	.034	.002	.059	.024	.018	.106	1.298	.197	-.013	.060
<u>Step 2</u>														
M	.002	.054	.004	.046	.964	-.103	.108	-.101	.062	-.133	-1.626	.107	-.225	.022
PP	.188	.076	.219	2.470	.014	.038	.337	.278	.079	.356	3.505	.001	.121	.435

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

	Females							Males						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper						Lower	Upper
SP	.125	.102	.099	1.235	.218	-.075	.326	.252	.121	.165	2.092	.039	.013	.491
GN	.082	.039	.152	2.109	.036	.005	.159	.152	.052	.236	2.939	.004	.050	.254
VN	.032	.015	.163	2.159	.032	.003	.060	.015	.018	.068	.833	.406	-.021	.052
S	-.026	.079	-.028	-.323	.747	-.182	.130	.136	.063	.195	2.149	.034	.011	.262
<u>Step 3</u>														
M	-.014	.052	-.022	-.275	.784	-.117	.089	-.106	.062	-.139	-1.705	.091	-.230	.017
PP	.152	.074	.178	2.048	.042	-.096	.299	.267	.079	.343	3.365	.001	.110	.425
SP	.099	.099	.078	.998	.320	-.096	.294	.227	.122	.148	1.864	.065	-.014	.467
GN	.116	.039	.213	2.960	.003	.039	.193	.156	.052	.241	3.014	.003	.053	.258

(continued)

Table 5 (continued)

	Females							Males						
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper						Lower	Upper
VN	.981	.483	.149	2.033	.043	.029	1.933	.586	.628	.076	.933	.353	-.658	1.830
S	-.042	.077	-.045	-.544	.587	-.194	.110	.128	.064	.182	2.007	.047	.002	.253
RS	-.082	.023	-.243	-3.559	.000	-.128	-.037	-.042	.031	-.089	-1.345	.181	-.104	.020

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction.

Discussion

This research aimed to investigate the predictors of the ability and willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. Findings differed as a function of gender, and hypotheses were partially supported.

Overview of Findings

The first hypothesis, that the combination of Dark Triad traits would predict both ability to emotionally manipulate and willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners received partial support. Contrary to predictions, primary psychopathy did not predict ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. However, as hypothesised, primary psychopathy positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners among both genders. Also as hypothesised, secondary psychopathy positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, however this finding was observed only among males. The hypothesis that Machiavellianism would positively predict ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners was not supported. For both genders, as hypothesised, grandiose narcissism positively predicted ability to emotionally manipulate partners, whilst vulnerable narcissism positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners for females only.

The second hypothesis was partially supported. Contrary to predictions, sadism did not add significant variance over and above the Dark Triad in prediction of ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners for either gender. However, as predicted, the addition of sadism explained significant additional variance over the Dark Triad in willingness to emotionally manipulate partners but this was observed only among males.

The hypothesis that the addition of relationship satisfaction would explain the additional amount of variance in emotional manipulation ability and emotional manipulation willingness, over and above sadism and Dark Triad, received partial support. Specifically, for females, relationship satisfaction explained significant additional variance in willingness, but not ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. No effect of relationship satisfaction was evident for males.

Emotional Manipulation Ability

Contrary to previous research, primary psychopathy (e.g., Austin & O'Donnell, 2013; Grieve & Panebianco, 2013) and Machiavellianism (e.g., Austin et al., 2007) did not predict ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partner for either gender. This finding is surprising given that primary psychopaths are predominantly characterised by having manipulative tendencies towards others (Levenson et al., 1995), and that Machiavellians are skilful at emotional manipulation to achieve their goals (Austin et al., 2007). A possible interpretation is that perhaps those with high levels of Machiavellianism often need a reliable and longstanding romantic partner who shares similar goals with them to achieve highly ambitious social goals (e.g., receiving work promotion) (Dussault et al., 2013). As such, emotional manipulation within the relationship is not necessary. However, an alternative explanation is that the effect of Machiavellianism is often driven by other Dark Triad members. If so, once the shared variance between the Dark Triad members is accounted for, the impact of Machiavellianism on variables in question is reduced (e.g., Jonason, Luevano, & Adams, 2012). Similarly, in regards to psychopathy, because the current study was the first to consider the combined effects of all of the Dark Triad members, this may have revealed clearer (Furnham et al.,

2013) but perhaps attenuated (e.g., Jonason & Tost, 2010) effects of each Dark Triad member.

Grandiose narcissism positively predicted ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners for both genders, which is in accordance with previous research (e.g., Nagler et al., 2014). Those with a high sense of self-worth and entitlement, need for admiration, and envy are more likely to perceive that they are able to emotionally manipulate partners. The present finding is plausible given the grandiose nature and interpersonal styles (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010) that characterise grandiose narcissism.

Addition of sadism did not improve prediction of ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, over and above the Dark Triad for either gender. Sadists are characterised by having longstanding need to declare dominance over others for personal pleasure (O'Meara et al., 2011). To establish this dominance, sadists need to engage in physical cruelty, humiliation and violence towards others (Segal, Coolidge, & Rosowsky, 2006). Therefore, while sadists may know how to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, perhaps they may be less likely to report this ability, as they need to actually engage in cruel behaviours to obtain gains.

In contrast to predictions, relationship satisfaction did not predict ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, over and above Dark Triad and sadism, for either gender. The present finding is novel, hence comparison with previous literature is limited, however this result does not reflect the association between emotional manipulation and relationship satisfaction seen previously (Shackelford & Buss, 2000; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004). Perhaps the aversive personality traits play a more substantial role in emotional manipulation ability than relationship satisfaction, due to the close nature of romantic relationships. Specifically, increased

closeness among romantic partners (i.e., high intimacy) allows a richer understanding of person's weaknesses and insecurities, which can be especially appealing to those with aversive traits (Ali & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2010) who are particularly interested in identifying and manipulating these insecurities for self-serving purposes (Hare, 1999). Therefore, relationship closeness may provide those with highly aversive traits better ability to emotionally manipulate romantic partners.

Emotional Manipulation Willingness

Consistent with Hyde and Grieve (2014) primary psychopathy positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners for both genders. Thus, individuals who are highly callous, display shallow affect, and lack remorse report often engaging in emotional manipulation of romantic partners. A potential explanation is the propensity for interpersonal manipulation (Levenson et al., 1995) and the lack of self-control (Prado, Treeby, & Crowe, 2015) that characterises primary psychopathy. Therefore, it may be that those with greater primary psychopathy engage in emotional manipulation of romantic partners due to their high tendency to manipulate others and difficulty controlling their actions.

For males, secondary psychopathy positively predicted willingness to manipulate romantic partners. This aligns with Hyde and Grieve (2014), suggesting that males who are highly impulsive, aggressive and prone to antisocial behaviours report often engaging in emotional manipulation of romantic partners. Hence, impulsive nature of those with high levels of secondary psychopathy may lead to inability to inhibit emotionally manipulative responses and can explain engagement in emotional manipulation.

Grandiose narcissism predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners for both genders, suggesting that those with an inflated self-worth

and entitlement also report frequently engaging in emotional manipulation of their partners. As with those that are grandiose and *able* to emotionally manipulate partners, narcissistic grandiosity and a tendency to manipulate others might also explain willingness. Specifically, those with high grandiose narcissism may think that they are good at things, and hence endorse that they are not only able, but also willing to engage in emotional manipulation. It is also possible that those with grandiose narcissism believe that they can escape any consequences arising from emotional manipulation.

For females, vulnerable narcissism positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, which aligns with previous research which found the link between manipulation tactics and vulnerable narcissism (e.g., Austin et al., 2014). Thus, females with traits of fragile narcissism signified by low self-esteem, social withdrawal, and feelings of inadequacy report often engaging in emotional manipulation of romantic partners. An explanation for this finding can be found in Okada's (2010) study where individuals with high levels of vulnerable narcissism who recalled personal experiences of social rejection provided more aggressive evaluations of the person who rejected them. Since vulnerable narcissists are highly sensitive to others evaluations, easily hurt by others and have a strong sense of entitlement (Besser & Priel, 2009; Wink, 1991), any perception that others do not regard them as unique or if others evaluate them negatively (Baumeister & Campbell, 1999) may lead to aggression (Okada, 2010). Therefore, it may also be that those with high vulnerable narcissism engage in emotional manipulation if they perceive that their romantic partners do not regard them as important, or if their egotism has been threatened.

For males, the addition of sadism improved prediction of willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, over and above the Dark Triad. This finding may be attributed to the aggression (e.g., Reidy, Zeichner, & Seibert, 2011), impulsivity, and antisocial behaviours (Chabrol et al., 2009), as well as willingness to hurt others (Buckels et al., 2013) that sadists often utilise to assert their dominance to obtain personal pleasure (Millon, Grossman, Millon, Meagher, & Ramnath, 2004; Segal et al., 2006). Therefore, being highly motivated to establish power over others and to gain pleasure from it and being unable to inhibit one's actions may facilitate frequent engagement in emotional manipulation of romantic partners.

Results further suggested that among females, addition of relationship satisfaction improved prediction of willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners, over and above the Dark Triad and sadism. Specifically, females that are dissatisfied with their relationship reported often engaging in emotional manipulation of their partners. Such finding is novel, and hence comparison with previous research is limited, however, a laboratory study reported by Fitness and Peterson (2008) may provide some insight.

Specifically, Fitness and Peterson (2008) found that those in the experimental group who thought about their partner-related betrayal, punished their partners (inflicted pain by administering hot chilli sauce) more than control group. Females punished their partners more severely and this punishment was negatively related to relationship satisfaction. The authors concluded that by engaging in punishment, females who are dissatisfied with a relationship send their partner a signal that relationship standards have been impaired. While it is unclear whether our participants experienced betrayal, it may be that by engaging in emotional

manipulation females aimed to notify their partners that relationship is potentially damaged.

Ability versus Willingness to Emotionally Manipulate

The current findings highlight the fact that just because a person knows how to emotionally manipulate (at least as assessed via self-report), the extent to which they will engage in emotional manipulation may not necessarily follow. In a romantic context, differentiation between ability to emotionally manipulate and willingness to emotionally manipulate was evident in that primary and secondary psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, sadism and relationship satisfaction predicted only willingness to emotionally manipulate, while grandiose narcissism predicted both ability and willingness to emotionally manipulate. Therefore, those with antisocial, callous, aggressive tendencies, sensitivity to others' evaluations, and relationship dissatisfaction are more likely to frequently engage in emotional manipulative behaviours towards their romantic partners. However, these findings varied as a function of gender.

Unpacking Gender Differences

Results showed that individual predictors of willingness (but not ability) to emotionally manipulate romantic partners differ as a function of gender. Specifically, males with high levels of secondary psychopathy and sadism were more willing to engage in emotional manipulation, while for females high levels of vulnerable narcissism and relationship dissatisfaction were key predictors. These gender differences in romantic context may reflect a lack of connection (i.e., increased aggression) among males and an increased connection (i.e., high importance of relationship satisfaction) among females which is comparable to the difference in the use of aggression among genders. Specifically, males tend to have a higher

preference for the use of direct or overt form of aggression (e.g., physical) compared to females who tend to use more indirect forms of aggression such as gossip (e.g., Archer, 2004; Archer & Coyne, 2005).

Further insight into the mechanisms of gender differences in emotional manipulation of romantic partners might be obtained using social structural theory which emphasises the effects of gender roles (i.e., traditional male versus traditional female roles) (Grieve & Mahar, 2010). The influence of gender roles to explain gender differences in psychopathy (e.g., Forouzan & Cooke, 2005) and narcissism (e.g., Grijalva et al., 2015) has already been recognised. Specifically, Forouzan and Cooke (2005) have used social structural theory to explain why males tend to have higher levels of psychopathy than females and Grijalva et al. (2015) have used this theory to explain why males tend to have somewhat higher levels of narcissism than females.

Social structural theory claims that gender differences occur since males and females occupy differing social roles which carry different role expectations (Wood & Eagly, 2002). Specifically, traditional male gender roles are associated with high power and status, and adherence to these roles yields dominant or agentic behaviours which are controlling, competitive, directive, may include sexual control (Eagly & Wood, 1999; Ridgeway & Diekema, 1992) and require high emotional stability (Grossman & Wood, 1993). In contrast, traditional female gender roles are characterised by provision of emotional support (Wood & Eagly, 2002) and lack of power and status (Eagly & Wood, 1999), hence adherence to these roles produces subordinate or communal characteristics, such as high emotional expressiveness, sensitivity to emotional cues (Grossman & Wood, 1993), nurturance, and

maintenance of interpersonal relationships (Eagly & Wood, 1999; Grijalva et al., 2015).

Based on this social structural approach, the finding that sadism and secondary psychopathy predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners for males only is plausible given that dominant and antisocial nature of these traits align with the agentic characteristic of traditional male gender roles. Moreover, these gender differences may be due to the assessment bias as majority of the aversive personality assessment tools capture behaviours that are more agentic than communal (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005; Rogstad & Rogers, 2008). For example, material dependence on others may be socially acceptable for females, while among males such behaviours may be judged as parasitic (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005).

Finding that for females only, heightened vulnerable narcissism predicted emotional manipulation willingness also aligns with social structural theory. Grijalva et al. (2015) suggested that females may have higher levels of vulnerable narcissism than males due to the neuroticism or low emotional stability component of vulnerable narcissism. Indeed, research has indicated that females have shown higher levels of neuroticism (e.g., Burton, Hafetz, & Henninger, 2007) and emotional intensity (e.g., Grossman & Wood, 1993) than males. Hence, these and the current findings might reflect social roles whereby males are believed to be emotionally stable, while females more emotionally sensitive (Grossman & Wood, 1993).

Lastly, social structural theory can be used to explain the finding that relationship satisfaction negatively predicted emotional manipulation willingness only in females. Specifically, female gender roles include homemaker and caretaker positions, emphasising communal characteristics (e.g., maintaining interpersonal relationships) (Wood & Eagly, 2002). Within this framework, relationship

satisfaction may be more relevant for females than males. When dissatisfied, females may potentially fear losing their homemaker role and therefore may be more willing to emotionally manipulate their romantic partner.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

A limitation of the present study is that it employed all self-report measures without examining observed emotional manipulation behaviours. Therefore, it is unclear whether participants who report often engaging in emotional manipulation actually succeed in such acts. Examining the effectiveness of emotional manipulation aligns with maximal performance approaches in the assessment of emotional intelligence, which use behavioural measures (e.g. Mayer et al., 2008). Therefore, to further clarify the distinction between self-reported and successful emotional manipulation, future research could use behavioural measure of emotional manipulation frequency.

For example, a dyadic approach including both members of a couple could be used. Within this alternative paradigm, the self-reported emotional manipulation ability and willingness of one partner could be triangulated with the received emotional manipulation experienced by the other partner. This would allow confirmation of how successful their partner was in emotional manipulation, providing additional evidence.

This study used a correlational design. Hence, while the results suggest that certain independent predictors contributed to the models, no inferences about the causal relationships can be made (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). However, as personality traits are considered to be relatively stable over time, it is reasonable to infer that emotional manipulation occurs as a function of the Dark Triad and sadism, given the conceptual nature of these characteristics. Further, the present findings are

valuable in that they add to the existing literature and in that way invite future research to develop theory upon which the causal relationships can be based. For example, gender roles could be utilised as moderators of the links between relationship satisfaction, aversive traits and emotional manipulation (ability and willingness).

In accordance with recommendations (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), the present study had sufficient number of both male and female participants to reach adequate power for conducting regression analyses. However, it may still be beneficial for future research to include larger male sample. Including larger male sample may allow for gender differences to be examined more closely and effectively, as the effect of each predictor becomes clearer in regression (Kelley & Maxwell, 2003).

It was beyond the scope of the present research to distinguish between different types of romantic relationships (e.g., married, long-term relationships). Research indicates that males and females differ in the way that they behave when approaching short-term and long-term relationships (e.g., Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007; March & Grieve, in press). Related to this, the use of certain manipulation tactics (e.g., appearance enhancement) declines with time spent in the relationship (e.g., Kaighobadi, Shackelford, & Buss, 2010). However, the present study did not find significant links between emotional manipulation (ability and willingness) and relationship length. Nonetheless, it is recommended that emotional manipulation be examined within a wide range of intimate relationships, therefore potentially revealing whether these constructs are present in some romantic contexts more than others.

Specific manipulation tactics in the context of emotional manipulation within romantic relationships could also be investigated to provide a more distinguished view of both ability and willingness aspects of emotional manipulation. Identifying which tactics are associated with willingness to emotionally manipulate is of particular importance, especially since some manipulation tactics are associated with violence towards romantic partners (Shackelford et al., 2005).

To further clarify the nature of emotional manipulation, the role of other constructs previously implicated in emotional manipulation ability, such as alexithymia, ethical positioning (e.g., Grieve & Mahar, 2010), and empathy (e.g., Grieve & Panebianco, 2013) could be investigated. Alexithymia refers to the difficulty in identifying and describing one's feelings (Taylor, 1987) and is often separated into three factors: difficulty identifying feelings, difficulty describing feelings, and externally oriented thinking (Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994). Grieve and Mahar (2010) found that alexithymia did not predict emotional manipulation, however their study did not consider the separate contribution of all three alexithymia factors. This represents a substantial limitation in the conclusions that can be made from their study, as three factor models of the alexithymia tend to have better fit (see Parker, Taylor, & Bagby, 2003).

Grieve and Mahar (2010) also examined the link between ethical positioning or a cohesive set of beliefs and values which drive a person's decisions towards right or wrong (Schlenker, 2008) and emotional manipulation ability. Findings indicated that lower levels of ethical idealism or a belief in the existence of a single ethically correct choice when facing ethical dilemmas in any situation (Forsyth, 1980) were associated with high levels of emotional manipulation ability among females, but not males.

Finally, empathy is defined as ability to share emotional experiences of others (Singer & Lamm, 2009). Contrary to expectations empathy did not predict emotional manipulation ability (see Grieve & Panebianco, 2013), however considering that this finding contradicts vast research that indicates the negative links between empathy and antisocial traits (e.g., Jonason, Lyons, Bethell, & Ross, 2013; Kaukiainen et al., 1999), more research into the link between empathy and emotional manipulation is warranted. It is possible that alexithymia, ethical position and empathy could help to delineate one's ability, from one's willingness to emotionally manipulate.

Implications

The present study for the first time examined the individual predictors of willingness to emotionally manipulate and ability to emotionally manipulate in the romantic context, and in that way provided novel insights into the nature of emotional manipulation. These findings shed new light onto the distinction between willingness and ability to emotionally manipulate, and hence inform a new and exciting area for future research.

In terms of contribution to theory, the present study not only considered contribution of the comprehensive Dark Triad to the prediction of emotional manipulation (both ability and willingness), but also took a step further by analysing the role of sadism. The finding that sadism added variance in prediction of emotional manipulation willingness, over and above Dark Triad has theoretical implications as it adds to the existing literature which argues that sadism has a unique contribution beyond the Dark Triad traits (e.g., Buckels et al., 2013). Hence, sadism merits its inclusion into the existing Dark Triad taxonomy (i.e., the Dark Tetrad).

It is also hoped that the present findings may have clinical applications, especially in couples therapy where the initial focus may be an increase in couples'

awareness around which aversive traits are associated with willingness to emotionally manipulate. This awareness is often the primary step in any behaviour change (Seaward, 2011) and can also assist those that are manipulated in understanding the reasons why their partner is engaging in emotional manipulation. Then the impact of emotional manipulation on romantic partners could be discussed in therapy, which could potentially increase the need and motivation for behaviour change (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). Strategies to manage dominant and aggressive behaviours among males could include benefits/cost analysis of aggression, trigger recognition and anger management (McKay & Rogers, 2000). For females, strategies to manage sensitivity to others evaluations and relationship dissatisfaction could include emotional regulation skills (Linehan, 1993) and exploration of relationship satisfaction in therapy. Of course, the potential utility of increased awareness of emotional manipulation and associated behavioural strategies would need to be validated within the therapeutic context.

It is also possible that the present findings may have preventative and educational purpose for those that frequently choose partners that are controlling and manipulative by assisting these individuals in making better relationship choices in future (see Bennett, Riger, Schewe, Howard, & Wasco, 2004). This could perhaps be achieved by providing psycho-education around the links between aversive personality traits and engagement in emotional manipulation in either therapeutic or domestic violence victim support settings.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the present findings contribute to the growing evidence that emotional intelligence has a ‘dark’ side. The novel feature of the present research was that aversive personality traits and relationship satisfaction differentiate between

emotional manipulation ability and emotional manipulation willingness within romantic relationships. Findings differed as a function of gender. For females, grandiose narcissism significantly positively predicted emotional manipulation ability, while higher levels of primary psychopathy, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, and lower relationship satisfaction significantly predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partner. For males, grandiose narcissism significantly positively predicted emotional manipulation ability, while primary and secondary psychopathy, grandiose narcissism, and sadism positively predicted willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partner. Such findings have added to the conceptual and empirical understanding of emotional manipulation, and the distinction between ability and willingness to emotionally manipulate. These findings inform a wide array of opportunities for future research to further examine the reasons for gender differences in romantic context, and thereby further clarify the nature of emotional manipulation.

References

- Abell, L., Brewer, G., Qualter, P., & Austin, E. (2016). Machiavellianism, emotional manipulation, and friendship functions in women's friendships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 88, 108-113. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.001
- Ali, F., Amorim, I. S., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2009). Empathy deficits and trait emotional intelligence in psychopathy and Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(7), 758-762. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.016
- Ali, F., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2010). The dark side of love and life satisfaction: Associations with intimate relationships, psychopathy and Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 228-233. Retrieved from www.drtomascp.com
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 440-450. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002
- Archer, J. (2004). Sex Differences in Aggression in Real-World Settings: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(4), 291-322. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.8.4.304.supp
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(3), 212-230. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0903_2
- Austin, E. J., Farrelly, D., Black, C., & Moore, H. (2007). Emotional intelligence, Machiavellianism and emotional manipulation: Does EI have a dark side?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 179-189. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.11.019

- Austin, E. J., & O'Donnell, M. M. (2013). Development and preliminary validation of a scale to assess managing the emotions of others. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55, 834-839. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net
- Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., Smith, M., & Tohver, G. (2014). Associations of the managing the emotions of others (MEOS) scale with personality, the Dark Triad and trait EI. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 65, 8-13. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.060>
- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto alexithymia scale-I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 38, 23-32. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net
- Baughman, H. M., Dearing, S., Giammarco, E., & Vernon, P. A. (2012). Relationships between bullying behaviours and the Dark Triad: A study with adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 571-575. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.020
- Baumeister, R. F., & Campbell, W. K. (1999). The intrinsic appeal of evil: Sadism, sensational thrills, and threatened egotism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 210-221. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Bennett, L., Riger, S., Schewe, P., Howard, A., & Wasco, S. (2004). Effectiveness of hotline, advocacy, counseling, and shelter services for victims of domestic violence: a statewide evaluation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(7), 815-829. doi: 10.1177/0886260504265687
- Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2009). Emotional responses to a romantic partner's imaginary rejection: the roles of attachment anxiety, covert narcissism, and self-

- evaluation. *Journal of Personality*, 77(1), 287-325. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00546.x
- Buckels, E. E., Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Behavioural confirmation of everyday sadism. *Psychological Science*, 24, 2201-2209. doi: 10.1177/0956797613490749
- Burton, L. A., Hafetz, J., & Henninger, D. (2007). Gender differences in relational and physical aggression. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 35(1), 41-50. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Buss, D. M. (1987). Selection, evocation, and manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1214-1221. Retrieved from www.doi.apa.org
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9, 291-317. Retrieved from www.homepage.psy.utexas.edu
- Buss, D. M. (1992). Manipulation in close relationships: Five personality factors in interactional context. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 477-499. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>
- Buss, D. M., Gomes, M., Higgins, D. S., & Lauterbach, K. (1987). Tactics of manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(6), 1219-1229. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(2), 346-361. Retrieved from www.toddkshackelford.com
- Cain, N. M., Pincus, A. L., & Ansell, E. B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory,

- social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 638–656. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2007.09.006
- Carroll, J. B. (1961). The nature of the data, or how to choose a correlation coefficient. *Psychometrika*, 26(4), 347-372. Retrieved from www.link.springer.com
- Chabrol, H., Leeuwen, N. V., Rodgers, R., & Sejourne, N. (2009). Contributions of psychopathic, narcissistic, Machiavellian, and sadistic personality traits to juvenile delinquency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 734–739. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.020
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 539-561. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- De Raad, B. (2005). The trait-coverage of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 673-687. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.05.022
- Dickinson, K. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 17(3), 188–207. doi:10.1521/pedi.17.3.188.22146
- Douglas, H., Bore, M., & Munro, D. (2012). Construct validity of a two-factor model of psychopathy. *Psychology*, 3(3), 243-248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2012.33034>

- Dussault, M., Hojjat, M., & Boone, R. T. (2013). Machiavellianism and Dating: Deception and Intimacy. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(2), 283-294. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2013.41.2.283
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behaviour: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54(6), 408-423. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/>
- Epstein, S. (1998). *Constructive thinking: The key to emotional intelligence*. Westport, USA: Greenwood Press.
- Ermer, E., Kahn, R. E., Salovey, P., & Kiehl, K. A. (2012). Emotional intelligence in incarcerated men with psychopathic traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(1), 194-204. doi: 10.1037/a0027328
- Fitness, J. (2001). Emotional intelligence and intimate relationships. In J. Ciarrochi, J. P. Forgas, & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life: A scientific inquiry* (pp. 98-112). Psychology Press: Philadelphia.
- Fitness, J. (2006). The emotionally intelligent marriage. In J. Ciarrochi, J. P. Forgas, & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life* (2nd ed., pp. 129–139). New York: Psychology Press.
- Fitness, J., & Matthews, S. (1998). *Emotions, emotional intelligence, and forgiveness in marriage*. Paper presented at the 9th International Conference on Personal Relationships, Saratoga Springs, New York.
- Fitness, J., & Peterson, J. (2008). [“Food choices” study]. Unpublished manuscript.
- Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., & Thomas, G. (2000). The measurement of perceived relationship quality components: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 340-354.
Retrieved from www.researchgate.net

- Forouzan, E., & Cooke, D. J. (2005). Figuring out la femme fatale: conceptual and assessment issues concerning psychopathy in females. *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, 23(6), 765-778. doi: 10.1002/bsl.669
- Forsyth, D. R. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 175–184. Retrieved from <https://facultystaff.richmond.edu/>
- Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The dark triad of personality: A 10 year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(3), 199-216. doi: 10.1111/spc3.12018
- Gentile, B., Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., & Campbell, W. K. (2013). A test of two brief measures of grandiose narcissism: The narcissistic personality inventory–13 and the narcissistic personality inventory–16. *Psychological Assessment*, 25, 1120-1136. doi: 10.1037/a0033192
- Giammarco, E. A., Atkinson, B., Baughman, H. M., Veselka, L., & Vernon, P. A. (2013). The relation between antisocial personality and the perceived ability to deceive. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 246-250. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.004>
- Grieve, R. (2011). Mirror mirror: The role of self-monitoring and sincerity in emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 981-985. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.08.004
- Grieve, R., & Mahar, D. (2010). The emotional manipulation–psychopathy nexus: Relationships with emotional intelligence, alexithymia and ethical position. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(8), 945-950. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.028

- Grieve, R., & Panebianco, L. (2013). Assessing the role of aggression, empathy, and self-serving cognitive distortions in trait emotional manipulation. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 65(2), 79-88. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-9536.2012.00059.x
- Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. (2015). Gender differences in narcissism: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(2), 261-310. doi: 10.1037/a0038231
- Grossman, M., & Wood, W. (1993). Sex differences in intensity of emotional experience: A social role interpretation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(5), 1010-1022. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net/
- Hare, R. (1999). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of the psychopaths among us*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Hodson, G., Hogg, S. M., & MacInnis, C. C. (2009). The role of “dark personalities” (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy), Big Five personality factors, and ideology in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 686-690. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.02.005
- Hyde, J., & Grieve, R. (2014). Able and willing: Refining the measurement of emotional manipulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 131-134. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.036
- Jackson, J. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2007). The structure and measurement of human mating strategies: Toward a multidimensional model of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 382 - 391. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehv.2007.04.005
- Jonason, P. K., Luevano, V. X., & Adams, H. M. (2012). How the Dark Triad traits predict relationship choices. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(3), 180-184. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.007

- Jonason, P. K., Lyons, M., Bethell, E. J., & Ross, R. (2013). Different routes to limited empathy in the sexes: Examining the links between the Dark Triad and empathy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 572-576.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.009>
- Jonason, P. K., & Tost, J. (2010). I just cannot control myself: The Dark Triad and self-control. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49, 611–615.
doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.05.031
- Kachadourian, L. K., Fincham, F., & Davila, J. (2004). The tendency to forgive in dating and married couples: The role of attachment and relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 11, 373-393. Retrieved from www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com
- Kaighobadi, F., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2010). Spousal mate retention in the newlywed year and three years later. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(4), 414-418. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.11.008
- Kaukiainen, A., Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Osterman, K., Salmivalli, C., Rothberg, S., & Ahlbom, A. (1999). The relationship between social intelligence, empathy and three types of aggression. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 25, 81-89. Retrieved from www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com
- Kealy, D., & Rasmussen, B. (2012). Veiled and vulnerable: The other side of grandiose narcissism. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 40, 356-365. doi: 10.1007/s10615-011-0370-1
- Kelley, K., & Maxwell, S. E. (2003). Sample size for multiple regression: obtaining regression coefficients that are accurate, not simply significant. *Psychological Methods*, 8(3), 305-321. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.8.3.305

- Kemp, A. H., Cooper, N. J., Hermens, G., Gordon, E., Bryant, R., & Williams, L. M. (2005). Toward an integrated profile of emotional intelligence: Introducing a brief measure. *Journal of Integrative Neuroscience*, 4(1), 41-61. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>
- Keppel, G., & Wickens, T. D. (2004). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Kilduff, M., Chiaburu, D. S., & Menges, J. I. (2010). Strategic use of emotional intelligence in organizational settings: Exploring the dark side. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 129-152. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2010.10.002
- Kubarych, T. S., Deary, I. J., & Austin, E. J. (2004). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: factor structure in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 857-872. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00158-2
- Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalised population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(1), 151-158. Retrieved from [www.
http://psycnet.apa.org/](http://psycnet.apa.org/)
- Linehan, M. M. (1993). *Cognitive-behavioural treatment of borderline personality disorder*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Malouff, J. M., Schutte, N. S., & Thorsteinsson, E. B. (2014). Trait emotional intelligence and romantic relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 42, 53-66. doi: 10.1080/01926187.2012.748549
- March, E., & Grieve, R. (2015). Social-economic theory and short-term mate preferences: The effects of gender roles and socio-economic status. *Australian Journal of Psychology*. Accepted Pending Revisions.

- Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. (2010). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49, 554-564. Retrieved from www.psychometriclab.com
- Mayer, J. D. (2001). Emotion, intelligence, and emotional intelligence. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.). *Handbook of affect and social cognition* (pp. 410-431). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63(6), 503-517. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.6.503
- McHoskey, J. W., Worzel, W., & Szyarto, C. (1998). Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 192-210. Retrieved from www.ovidsp.tx.ovid.com
- McKay, M., & Rogers, P. (2000). *The anger control workbook*. Oakland: New Harbinger Publications.
- Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 79, 1013-1042. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2013). *Motivational interviewing: Helping people change* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Millon, T., Grossman, S., Millon, C., Meagher, S., & Ramnath, R. (2004). *Personality disorders in modern life* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unravelling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12(4), 177-196. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1449484>
- Nagler, U. K. J., Reiter, K. J., Furtner, M. R., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2014). Is there a “dark intelligence”? Emotional intelligence is used by dark personalities to emotionally manipulate others. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 65, 47-52. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.025
- O’Brien, R. M. (2007). A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 673-690. doi: 10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6
- Okada, R. (2010). The relationship between vulnerable narcissism and aggression in Japanese undergraduate students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(2), 113-118. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.017
- O’Meara, A., Davies, J., & Hammond, S. (2011). The psychometric properties and utility of the Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS). *Psychological Assessment*, 23, 523–531. doi:10.1037/a0022400
- Palmer, B., Donaldson, C., & Stough, C. (2002). Emotional intelligence and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 1091-1100. Retrieved from www.elsevier.com
- Parker, J. D. A., Taylor, G. J., & Bagby, R. M. (2003). The 20-Item Toronto Alexithymia Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 55(3), 269-275. doi: 10.1016/s0022-3999(02)00578-0
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 556-563. Retrieved from www.academicpress.com

- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 313-320. Retrieved from www.psychometriclab.com
- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 21, 365-379. doi: 10.1037/a0016530
- Pincus, A. L., Cain, N. M., & Wright, A. G. C. (in press). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability in psychotherapy. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. Retrieved from <http://www.sakkyndig.com/psykologi/artvit/pincus2014.pdf>
- Pincus, A. L., & Lukowitsky, M. R. (2010). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 6, 421-446. doi: 10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131215
- Prado, C. E., Treeby, M. S., & Crowe, S. F. (2015). Examining relationships between facial emotion recognition, self-control, and psychopathic traits in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 80, 22-27. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.02.013
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45, 159-162. Retrieved from www.psychology.okstate.edu
- Raskin, R. N., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct

validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890–902.

Retrieved from <http://psychology.okstate.edu/>

Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Investigating the MACH–IV with item response theory and proposing the trimmed MACH. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95, 388–397. doi: 10.1080/00223891.2012.742905

Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., & Seibert, L. A. (2011). Unprovoked aggression: Effects of psychopathic traits and sadism. *Journal of Personality*, 79(1), 75–100. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00691.x

Ridgeway, C. L., & Diekema, D. (1992). Are gender differences status differences? In C. L. Ridgeway (Ed.), *Gender, interaction, and inequality* (pp. 157–180). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Roberts, R. D., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2001). Does emotional intelligence meet traditional standards for an intelligence? Some new data and conclusions. *Emotion*, 1 (3), 196–231. doi: 10.1037//1528-3542.1.3.196

Rogstad, J. E., & Rogers, R. (2008). Gender differences in contributions of emotion to psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28(8), 1472–1484. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.09.004

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 185–211. Retrieved from <http://www.unh.edu>

Seaward, B. L. (2011). *Managing stress: Principles and strategies for health and well-being* (7th ed.). London, United Kingdom: Jones & Bartlett Learning International.

Segal, D. L., Coolidge, F. L., & Rosowsky, E. (2006). *Personality disorders and older adults: Diagnosis, assessment and treatment*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

- Schlenker, B. R. (2008). Integrity and character: Implications of principled and expedient ethical ideologies. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(10), 1078-1125. Retrieved from www.guilfordjournals.com
- Schroder-Abe, M., & Schutz, A. (2011). Walking in each other's shoes: Perspective taking mediates effects of emotional intelligence on relationship quality. *European Journal of Personality*, 25, 155–169. doi: 10.1002/per.818
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C.,...Rhodes, E., & Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 523-536. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Marital satisfaction and spousal cost-infliction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 917-928. Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com
- Shackelford, T. K., & Goetz, A. T. (2004). Men's sexual coercion in intimate relationships: Development and initial validation of the sexual coercion in intimate relationships scale. *Violence and Victims*, 19(5), 541-556. Retrieved from www.springerpublishingcompany.com
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & Buss, D. A. (2005). Mate retention in marriage: Further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 415-425. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.01.018
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., Buss, D. M., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (2005). When we hurt the ones we love: Predicting violence against women from women's mate retention. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 447–463. Retrieved from www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com

- Singer, T., & Lamm, C. (2009). The social neuroscience of empathy. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1156, 81-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04418.x
- Skeem, J., Johansson, P., Andershed, H., Kerr, M., & Louden, J. E. (2007). Two subtypes of psychopathic violent offenders that parallel primary and secondary variants. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116(2), 395-409. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.116.2.395
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Taylor, G. J. (1987). I alexithymia: History validation of the concept. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 24(85), 85-95. doi: 10.1177/136346158702400201
- Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4), 590 – 597. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/>
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(5), 699-727. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.128.5.699

Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaires.....	66
A1: Demographic Questions.....	66
A2: Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale.....	78
A3: Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability.....	70
A4: Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness.....	71
A5: Mach-IV.....	72
A6: Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16).....	74
A7: The Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI).....	75
A8: The Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS).....	77
A9: Perceived Relationship Quality Components Inventory (PRQC).....	78
Appendix B: Ethical Requirements.....	79
B1: Tasmanian Social Sciences HREC Approval.....	79
B2: Participant Information Sheet.....	81
B3: Consent Form.....	85
B4: Debriefing Statement.....	86
Appendix C: Preliminary Analysis Tables.....	88
Appendix C1: Difference in Responding as a Function of Survey Order....	88
Appendix C2: Difference in Responding as a Function of Gender.....	90
Appendix C3: Difference in Responding as a Function of Student Status....	92
Appendix C4: Correlation Matrix for Relationship Length, Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Entire Sample.....	94
Appendix D: SPSS Output.....	

Appendix A1

Demographic Questions

1. What is your age in years: _____
2. What is your gender?
 - ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female
 - ☐ Other: _____
3. Are you currently in a romantic relationship?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
4. Please indicate the length of your relationship

5. What is your sexual orientation?
 - ☐ Heterosexual
 - ☐ Homosexual
 - ☐ Bisexual
 - ☐ Other: _____
6. What is your occupation?

7. Please indicate your occupational category
 - ☐ Full Time
 - ☐ Part Time
 - ☐ Casual
 - ☐ Student
 - ☐ Home duties

- ☐ Unemployed

8. What is your first language?

- ☐ English
- ☐ Other:_____

9. What is your nationality?

- ☐ Australian
- ☐ Other:_____

10. Please indicate your highest level of education

- ☐ Some High School
- ☐ Completed Year 10 (or equivalent)
- ☐ Completed Year 12 (or equivalent)
- ☐ TAFE
- ☐ Incomplete Undergraduate Degree
- ☐ Completed Undergraduate Degree
- ☐ Incomplete Postgraduate
- ☐ Completed Postgraduate
- ☐ Masters
- ☐ Phd
- ☐ Other:_____

Appendix A2

Levenson's Self Report Psychopathy Scale

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

Response categories: One (*disagree strongly*); two (*disagree somewhat*); three (*agree somewhat*); four (*agree strongly*).

Primary Psychopathy

1. Success is based on survival of the fittest; I am not concerned about the losers
2. For me, what's right is whatever I can get away with
3. In today's world, I feel justified in doing anything I can get away with to succeed
4. My main purpose in life is getting as many goodies as I can
5. Making a lot of money is my most important goal
6. I let others worry about higher values; my main concern is with the bottom line
7. People who are stupid enough to get ripped off usually deserve it
8. Looking out for myself is my top priority
9. I tell other people what they want to hear so that they will do what I want them to do
10. I would be upset if my success came at someone else's expense*
11. I often admire a really clever scam
12. I make a point of trying not to hurt others in pursuit of my goals*
13. I enjoy manipulating other people's feelings
14. I feel bad if my words or actions cause someone else to feel emotional pain*
15. Even if I were trying very hard to sell something, I wouldn't lie about it*
16. Cheating is not justified because it is unfair to others*

Secondary Psychopathy

1. I find myself in the same kinds of trouble, time after time

2. I am often bored
3. I find that I am able to pursue one goal for a long time*
4. I don't plan anything very far in advance
5. I quickly lose interest in tasks I start
6. Most of my problems are due to the fact that other people just don't understand me
7. Before I do anything, I carefully consider the possible consequences*
8. I have been in a lot of shouting matches with other people
9. When I get frustrated I often "let off steam" by blowing my top
10. Love is overrated

Note. Items marked * are reverse scored.

Appendix A3

Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

Response categories: One (*strongly disagree*); two; three; four; five (*strongly agree*).

1. I know how to embarrass my partner to stop them behaving in a particular way.
2. I know how to make my partner feel uneasy.
3. I know how to play my partner off against another person
4. I know how to make my partner feel ashamed about something that they have done in order to stop them from doing it again.
5. I know how to 'wind up' my partner.
6. I can use my emotional skills to make me partner feel guilty.
7. I can make my partner feel anxious so that they will act in a particular way.
8. I can pay my partner compliments to get in their 'good books.'
9. I am good at reassuring my partner so that they're more likely to go along with what I say.
10. I sometimes pretend to be angrier than I really am about my partner's behaviour in order to induce them to behave differently in the future.

Appendix A4

Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness

Directions: Please answer each of the following.

Response categories: One (*never*); two (*now and then*); three (*monthly*); four (*weekly*); five (*daily*).

1. How often do you embarrass your partner to stop them behaving in a particular way?
2. How often do you make your partner feel uneasy?
3. How often do you play your partner off against another person?
4. How often do you make your partner feel ashamed about something that they have done in order to stop them from doing it again?
5. How often do you 'wind up' your partner?
6. How often do you use your emotional skills to make your partner feel guilty?
7. How often do you make your partner feel anxious so that they will act in a particular way?
8. How often do you pay your partner compliments to get in their 'good books'?
9. How often do you reassure your partner so that they're more likely to go along with what you say?
10. How often do you pretend to be angrier than you really are about your partner's behaviour in order to induce them to behave differently in the future?

Appendix A5

Mach-IV

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

Response categories: One (*strongly disagree*); two (*somewhat disagree*); three (*no opinion*); four (*somewhat agree*); five (*strongly agree*).

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so
2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear
3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right*
4. Most people are basically good and kind*
5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance
6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases*
7. There is no excuse for lying to someone else*
8. Generally speaking, people won't work hard unless they're forced to do so
9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest*
10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight*
11. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives*
12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble
13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught
14. Most people are brave*
15. It is wise to flatter important people
16. It is possible to be good in all respects*

17. Barnum was very wrong when he said there's a sucker born every minute*
18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there
19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death
20. Most people forget more easily the death of a parent than the loss of their property

Note. Items marked * are reverse scored.

Appendix A6

Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16)

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

Response categories: One (*strongly disagree*); two; three; four; five (*strongly agree*).

1. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so
2. I like to be the center of attention
3. I think I am a special person
4. I like having authority over people
5. I find it easy to manipulate people
6. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me
7. I am apt to show off if I get the chance
8. I always know what I am doing
9. Everybody likes to hear my stories
10. I expect a great deal from other people
11. I really like to be the center of attention
12. People always seem to recognize my authority
13. I am going to be a great person
14. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to
15. I am more capable than other people
16. I am an extraordinary person

Appendix A7

The Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI)

Directions: For each statement please indicate which response is most accurate for you.

Response categories: Zero (*not at all like me*); one; two; three; four; five (*very much like me*).

1. My self-esteem fluctuates a lot
2. I sometimes feel ashamed about my expectations of others when they disappoint me
3. It's hard to feel good about myself when I'm alone
4. I hate asking for help
5. When people don't notice me, I start to feel bad about myself
6. I often hide my needs for fear that others will see me as needy and dependent
7. I get mad when people don't notice all that I do for them
8. I get annoyed by people who are not interested in what I say or do
9. I wouldn't disclose all my intimate thoughts and feelings to someone I didn't admire
10. When others don't notice me, I start to feel worthless
11. Sometimes I avoid people because I'm concerned that they'll disappoint me
12. I typically get very angry when I'm unable to get what I want from others
13. I sometimes need important others in my life to reassure me of my self-worth
14. When I do things for other people, I expect them to do things for me
15. When others don't meet my expectations, I often feel ashamed about what I wanted
16. When others disappoint me, I often get angry at myself
17. Sometimes I avoid people because I'm afraid they won't do what I want them to
18. It's hard to show others the weaknesses I feel inside
19. I get angry when criticized

20. It's hard to feel good about myself unless I know other people admire me
21. I am preoccupied with thoughts and concerns that most people are not interested in me
22. Sometimes I avoid people because I'm concerned they won't acknowledge what I do for them
23. It's hard for me to feel good about myself unless I know other people like me
24. It irritates me when people don't notice how good a person I am
25. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve
26. I am disappointed when people don't notice me
27. I often find myself envying others' accomplishments
28. It's important to show people I can do it on my own, even if I have some doubts inside
29. I can't stand relying on other people because it makes me feel weak
30. When others don't respond to me the way that I would like them to, it is hard for me to still feel ok with myself
31. I need others to acknowledge me
32. When others get a glimpse of my needs, I feel anxious and ashamed
33. Sometimes it's easier to be alone than to face not getting everything I want from other people
34. I can get pretty angry when others disagree with me

Appendix A8

The Short Sadistic Impulse Scale (SSIS)

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

Response categories: One (*strongly disagree*); two; three; four; five; six (*strongly agree*).

1. People would enjoy hurting others if they gave it a go
2. Hurting people would be exciting
3. I have hurt people because I could
4. I wouldn't intentionally hurt anyone*
5. I have hurt people for my own enjoyment
6. I have humiliated others to keep them in line
7. I would enjoy hurting someone physically, sexually, or emotionally
8. I enjoy seeing people hurt
9. I have fantasies which involve hurting people
10. Sometimes I get so angry I want to hurt people

Note. Items marked * are reverse scored.

Appendix A9

Perceived Relationship Quality Components Inventory (PRQC)

Directions: Please answer each of the following.

Response categories: One (*not at all*); two; three; four; five; six; seven (*extremely*).

1. How satisfied are you with your relationship?
2. How content are you with your relationship?
3. How happy are you with your relationship?
4. How committed are you to your relationship?
5. How dedicated are you to your relationship?
6. How devoted are you to your relationship?
7. How intimate is your relationship?
8. How close is your relationship?
9. How connected are you to your partner?
10. How much do you trust your partner?
11. How much can you count on your partner?
12. How dependable is your partner?
13. How passionate is your relationship?
14. How lustful is your relationship?
15. How sexually intense is your relationship?
16. How much do you love your partner?
17. How much do you adore your partner?
18. How much do you cherish your partner?

Appendix B1

Tasmanian Social Sciences HREC Approval

Social Science Ethics Officer
 Private Bag 01 Hobart
 Tasmania 7001 Australia
 Tel: (03) 6226 2763
 Fax: (03) 6226 7148
 Katherine.Shaw@utas.edu.au



HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (TASMANIA) NETWORK

27 August 2014

Dr Rachel Grieve
 Psychology
 Private Bag 30

Dear Dr Grieve

Re: MINIMAL RISK ETHICS APPLICATION APPROVAL
Ethics Ref: H0014339 - Personality, Emotions and Romantic Relationships

We are pleased to advise that acting on a mandate from the Tasmania Social Sciences HREC, the Chair of the committee considered and approved the above project on 22 August 2014.

This approval constitutes ethical clearance by the Tasmania Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee. The decision and authority to commence the associated research may be dependent on factors beyond the remit of the ethics review process. For example, your research may need ethics clearance from other organisations or review by your research governance coordinator or Head of Department. It is your responsibility to find out if the approval of other bodies or authorities is required. It is recommended that the proposed research should not commence until you have satisfied these requirements.

Please note that this approval is for four years and is conditional upon receipt of an annual Progress Report. Ethics approval for this project will lapse if a Progress Report is not submitted.

The following conditions apply to this approval. Failure to abide by these conditions may result in suspension or discontinuation of approval.

1. It is the responsibility of the Chief Investigator to ensure that all investigators are aware of the terms of approval, to ensure the project is conducted as approved by the Ethics Committee, and to notify the Committee if any investigators are added to, or cease involvement with, the project.
2. Complaints: If any complaints are received or ethical issues arise during the course of the project, investigators should advise the Executive Officer of the Ethics Committee on 03 6226 7479 or human.ethics@utas.edu.au.

3. Incidents or adverse effects: Investigators should notify the Ethics Committee immediately of any serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants or unforeseen events affecting the ethical acceptability of the project.
4. Amendments to Project: Modifications to the project must not proceed until approval is obtained from the Ethics Committee. Please submit an Amendment Form (available on our website) to notify the Ethics Committee of the proposed modifications.
5. Annual Report: Continued approval for this project is dependent on the submission of a Progress Report by the anniversary date of your approval. You will be sent a courtesy reminder closer to this date. **Failure to submit a Progress Report will mean that ethics approval for this project will lapse.**
6. Final Report: A Final Report and a copy of any published material arising from the project, either in full or abstract, must be provided at the end of the project.

Yours sincerely

Ethics Officer
Tasmania Social Sciences HREC

Appendix B2

Participant Information Sheet

Invitation

You are invited to participate in a study examining personality, emotions and romantic relationships. This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of a Psychology Master degree for Tamara Bobera under the supervision of Dr Rachel Grieve in the School of Medicine (Psychology) at the University of Tasmania.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality, emotions and romantic relationships.

Why have I been invited to participate?

You are eligible to participate in this study because you are currently involved in a romantic relationship and you are over 18. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. There will be no consequences for individuals who do not wish to participate in this study.

What will I be asked to do?

If you decide to participate in the study you will be asked to complete a number of short questionnaires, for example you will be asked to indicate on a scale how much you agree with statements such as “*I am often touched by things that I see happen*”. You will also be asked to provide information about your age, gender, relationship status, length of romantic relationship, sexual orientation, occupation, first language, nationality, and education level. Questionnaires will be available to participants via an internet link. It is estimated that participation in the questionnaires will take 45 minutes in total. All responses that you provide will be completely anonymous, and no information that could identify you (such as your name) will be collected.

Are there any possibly benefits from participation in this study?

It is not anticipated that taking part in this study will result in any direct benefits to participants. However, participants from the general public will have the chance to win a \$100 Amazon gift voucher (please note, there will be no way to link your contact details for your prize entry with your questionnaire answers).

At the end of the survey you will have the option to click on one of two links to a separate page. Participants from the general public will click on a link where they can supply their name and contact details, which will allow us to notify you if you are selected to win a gift voucher.

First year students studying Psychology at the University of Tasmania will be provided 45 minutes research participation credit for their participation in this study by clicking on a different link that will direct you to a page with instructions on how to receive credit. Please note that first year UTAS psychology students seeking participation credit are not eligible to enter the draw to win a gift voucher.

Information from this study may assist in better understanding of the role of personality, and emotions in romantic relationships.

Are there any possible risks from participation in this study?

There are no specific risks anticipated with participation in this study, however if you would like to access counselling services they can do so by following this link: <http://www.utas.edu.au/students/counselling/personal-counselling>

What if I change my mind during or after the study?

It is important that you understand that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose to discontinue participation at any point throughout the

study without providing an explanation. All information you have provided to that point will be treated in a confidential manner.

What will happen to the information when this study is over?

All data will be collected using a secure online service. Once the data is transferred for analysis, it will be stored on a password-protected server in the School of Psychology. Research data will be kept for at least 5 years from the date of first publication. Following this, data will be deleted.

How will the results of the study be published?

A summary of the findings of the study will be posted on the University of Tasmania Division of Psychology web page. This summary will be available for participants to access from November 2015. No participants will be identified in the publication of the summary of the research findings.

What if I have questions about this study?

If you would like to discuss any aspect of this study please feel free to contact the research team:

Tamara Bobera – email tbobera@postoffice.utas.edu.au

Dr Rachel Grieve – email rachel.grieve@utas.edu.au – phone (03) 6226 2244

This study has been approved by the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have concerns or complaints about the conduct of this study, please contact the Executive Officer of the HREC (Tasmania) Network on (03) 6226 7479 or email human.ethics@utas.edu.au. The Executive Officer is the person nominated to receive complaints from research participants. Please quote ethics reference number H0014339.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study.

If you have read and understood all of the above information, and any questions have been answered to your satisfaction, you can proceed with the questionnaire.

Appendix B3

Online Consent Form

If you are 18 years or older, currently in a romantic relationship and give consent to participate in the above described research, please click the 'Next' button. Otherwise, please exit this window by clicking the cross. So that you can remain anonymous your consent will be assumed by your completion and submission of the survey.

Appendix B4

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for your participation in the present study.

The present study examined the role of personality constructs such as: psychopathy, narcissism, Machiavellianism and sadism in person's ability and willingness to emotionally manipulate romantic partners. The study also investigated the role of relationship satisfaction in person's emotional manipulation ability and willingness. If you are a student and have experienced any distress during the completion of the present survey, please contact counselling services by following this link:

<http://www.utas.edu.au/students/counselling/personal-counselling>. If you are a non-student and have experienced any distress during the completion of the present survey, please contact Lifeline by following this link: <https://www.lifeline.org.au/>

To thank you for your participation, if you are not a first year psychology UTAS student seeking research participation credit you may choose to enter the draw to win \$100 Amazon gift voucher. To enter the prize draw, please click on the link below and you will be redirected to the secure prize draw entry webpage where you can enter your contact details. Please note that each participant can only complete the survey once, and can only enter the prize draw once. If you do not select the link below you will be unable to enter the prize draw.

<https://surveys.psychol.utas.edu.au/index.php/336556/lang-en>

First year UTAS psychology students seeking research participation credit should click on the link below to be redirected to a page you can print out to attach to your workbook to receive 45 minutes research participation credit.

<https://surveys.psychol.utas.edu.au/index.php/461314/lang-en>

Please note that first year UTAS psychology students seeking research participation credit are not eligible to enter the prize draw.

Appendix C1

Difference in Responding as a Function of Gender

Table

Differences in Responding as a Function of Gender

Variables	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		95% CI					
	Males	Females	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Lower	Upper	Cohen's <i>d</i>
M	57.54 (9.46)	52.81 (8.55)	4.64	322	.000	2.72	6.73	0.54
PP	30.85 (9.28)	25.78 (6.38)	5.35	195 ^a	.000	3.36	3.20	0.63
SP	21.47 (4.73)	19.79 (4.29)	3.28	322	.001	0.67	2.68	0.37
GN	45.31 (11.22)	41.23 (10.07)	3.39	322	.001	1.72	6.45	0.38
PNI	65.83 (32.13)	63.15 (28.25)	0.78	322	.432	-5.63	-4.02	0.08
S	21.12 (10.36)	15.29 (5.88)	5.72	172 ^a	.000	4.05	7.61	0.69
PEMA	27.81 (11.38)	24.89 (9.92)	2.35	234 ^a	.019	0.55	5.28	0.27
PEMW	19.89 (7.24)	18.12 (5.45)	2.34	208 ^a	.020	0.28	3.26	0.27

(continued)

Table (continued)

Variables	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		95%CI					
	Males	Females	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Lower	Upper	Cohen's <i>d</i>
RS	104.99 (15.35)	108.82 (16.14)	-2.11	322	.035	-7.39	-0.26	-0.24

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction

N = 324; ^a = Levene's Test was significant

Appendix C2

Difference in Responding as a Function of Student Status

Table

Differences in Responding as a Function of Student Status

Variables	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Student	Non-student				Lower	Upper	
M	54.33 (8.90)	54.86 (9.44)	-0.51	322	.609	-2.54	1.49	-0.05
PP	28.15 (7.75)	27.37 (8.21)	0.87	322	.382	-0.97	2.54	0.09
SP	20.77 (4.50)	20.15 (4.55)	1.21	322	.224	-0.37	1.61	0.13
GN	42.54 (10.61)	43.00 (10.79)	-0.38	322	.699	-2.81	1.88	-0.04
PNI	66.73 (28.91)	62.06 (30.39)	1.40	322	.160	-1.85	11.19	0.15
S	18.18 (9.04)	16.97 (7.77)	1.30	322	.194	-0.62	3.05	0.14
PEMA	26.33 (11.10)	25.73 (10.15)	0.51	322	.610	-1.72	2.93	0.05
PEMW	19.30 (6.48)	18.37 (6.04)	1.32	322	.185	-0.44	2.29	0.14

(continued)

Table (continued)

Variables	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	95%CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Student	Non-student				Lower	Upper	
RS	107.03 (15.83)	107.62 (16.05)	-0.33	322	.742	-4.09	2.91	-0.03

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction
N = 324;

Appendix C3

Difference in Responding as a Function of Survey Order

Table

Differences in Responding as a Function of Survey Order

Variables	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		95% CI					
	Version 1	Version 2	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Lower	Upper	Cohen's <i>d</i>
M	54.13 (9.92)	55.14 (8.35)	-0.99	317 ^a	.320	-3.01	.98	-0.11
PP	28.01 (8.14)	27.42 (7.86)	0.66	322	.505	-1.15	2.34	0.07
SP	20.43 (4.54)	20.44 (4.54)	-0.01	322	.986	-1.00	0.98	-0.00
GN	43.97 (10.26)	41.55 (11.03)	2.04	322	.042	0.09	4.74	0.22
PNI	64.58 (31.22)	63.75 (28.27)	0.25	322	.801	-5.63	7.35	0.02
S	17.87 (8.52)	17.15 (8.25)	0.78	322	.436	-1.10	2.56	0.08
PEMA	25.80 (10.74)	26.22 (10.44)	-0.36	322	.718	-2.74	1.89	-0.03
PEMW	18.59 (6.42)	19.01 (6.08)	-0.59	322	.550	-1.78	0.95	-0.06

(continued)

Table (continued)

Variables	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		95%CI					
	Version 1	Version 2	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Lower	Upper	Cohen's <i>d</i>
RS	108.42 (15.48)	106.24 (16.36)	1.22	322	.220	-1.30	5.56	0.13

Note. M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction

N = 324; ^a = Levene's Test was significant

Appendix C4

Correlation Matrix for Relationship Length, Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Entire Sample

Table

Correlation Matrix for Relationship Length, Predictor and Outcome Variables for the Entire Sample

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RL	1.00									
M	-.02	1.00								
PP	-.08	.60**	1.00							
SP	-.03	.41**	.45**	1.00						
GN	-.02	.22**	.50**	.26**	1.00					
VN	-.11	.37**	.34**	.49**	.28**	1.00				
S	-.10	.54**	.66**	.45**	.50**	.34**	1.00			
PEMA	.03	.32**	.38**	.31**	.46**	.31**	.43**	1.00		
PEMW	-.01	.30**	.52**	.39**	.43**	.37**	.46**	.65**	1.00	

(continued)

Table (continued)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RS	.02	-.28**	-.27**	-.25**	.00	-.16**	-.26**	-.18*	-.29**	1.00

Note. RL=Relationship Length; M= Machiavellianism; PP= Primary Psychopathy; SP= Secondary Psychopathy; GN= Grandiose Narcissism; VN= Vulnerable Narcissism; S= Sadism; PEMA= Partner Emotional Manipulation Ability; PEMW= Partner Emotional Manipulation Willingness; RS= Relationship Satisfaction
N = 324, **p* < .05; ***p* < .001

